

Chapter 7: Coordination

This chapter describes the public and agency coordination efforts for the S.R. 108 EIS. The S.R. 108 EIS process was initiated on June 26, 2006, when a Notice of Intent was published in the *Federal Register* formally announcing that FHWA was preparing an EIS for the S.R. 108 project. The notice included a brief description of the proposed improvements and alternatives under consideration.

7.1 Public and Agency Involvement

Public and agency involvement is critical to the success of any project that could affect the community. The planning for the S.R. 108 EIS has involved extensive coordination and consultation with the affected community and agencies. The affected community includes not only the residents in the S.R. 108 corridor, but also individuals, businesses, groups, and others interested in the study area. The planning process was structured and implemented to ensure that all relevant factors were considered, including the affected community's concerns and issues related to the project's purpose and need, engineering solutions, social impacts, environmental impacts, economic effects, financing, and other items of concern to the community.

What members of the community were invited to participate in the S.R. 108 process?

The public involvement process for the S.R. 108 project involved coordination and consultation with not only the residents in the S.R. 108 corridor, but also individuals, businesses, groups, and others interested in the study area.

7.1.1 Public Outreach Activities and Information Exchange

The goal of the public and agency involvement program and process is to have an informed local community and government leadership to help make decisions regarding the impacts and implementation of a locally preferred alternative. The public and agency involvement process is open to ensure that interested parties have an opportunity to be involved in planning. Stakeholders had an opportunity to direct, review, and comment on the EIS analysis and results at major milestones reached during the course of the study.



7.1.2 SAFETEA-LU Section 6002

The public and agency involvement program was conducted in a manner consistent with NEPA and Section 106 regulations. This program has been designed to be consistent with the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) of 1998 and the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) of 2005.

7.2 Agency Coordination

Throughout the EIS process, UDOT has coordinated with local, state, and federal agencies that oversee the management of natural resources in the project area. Since these agencies oversee impacts and issue permits regarding their resource areas, it is important to include them from the initial scoping activities throughout the project's development. In this way, issues are identified early so that they can be properly considered and, if necessary, avoided, minimized, or mitigated as the project progresses.

The agencies were notified of the requirements of SAFETEA-LU Section 6002 at the agency scoping meetings. This EIS meets the intent of this regulation by reaching out to agencies and giving them an opportunity to provide input into and collaborate on the processes of defining the project purpose and identifying the alternatives.

7.2.1 Coordination Plan

The purpose of the S.R. 108 Coordination Plan is to identify the coordination that FHWA and UDOT are undertaking with the federal, state, and local agencies who agree to be participating or cooperating agencies during the NEPA process for the S.R. 108 corridor in accordance with SAFETEA-LU. This Coordination Plan defines the roles and expectations of the participating and cooperating agencies and establishes a commitment to review the EIS at specific milestones. The public was notified of the availability of the Public Involvement Plan at the public scoping meeting (see Section 7.3.2.1, Public Scoping Meeting).

What are cooperating agencies?

A cooperating agency is any federal agency, other than a lead agency, that has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved in a proposed project or project alternative. There are no cooperating agencies on the S.R. 108 project.

The participating agencies for the S.R. 108 EIS project are federal, state, or local agencies or organizations that might have an interest in the project. The participating agencies are:

- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Utah Transit Authority
- Utah State Historic Preservation Office
- Wasatch Front Regional Council
- City of Syracuse
- City of Roy
- City of West Point
- City of Clinton
- City of West Haven

There are no cooperating agencies on the project.

7.2.2 Agency Scoping

An agency scoping meeting was held on August 3, 2006, at the Weber State University West Center (5627 South 3500 West in Roy) with members of the project team and key regulatory agency representatives who were interested in the project. The purposes of the meeting were to provide the attendees with an understanding of the project's purpose and to obtain agency input on the project. The agency representatives were invited to comment on issues of special concern along S.R. 108. The agency comments were used, along with other transportation and environmental data and the analysis collected during the environmental studies, to help identify the purpose of the project, develop alternatives, and make decisions regarding the methodology for the alternative analysis.

Letters of notification were mailed on July 3, 2006, to about 28 agencies representing interests along S.R. 108. These letters invited agency representatives to attend the meeting, requested agency involvement as a cooperating or participating agency for the S.R. 108 EIS, and solicited agency comments on the resources in the corridor. Nine project and agency representatives attended the meeting. The meeting minutes, a summary of the comments received, and the meeting notification materials are included in the S.R. 108 Scoping Summary Report.

What are participating agencies?

Participating agencies are federal, state, or local agencies or organizations that might have an interest in the S.R. 108 project.

What were the purposes of the agency scoping meeting?

The purposes of the agency scoping meeting were to provide the attendees with an understanding of the project's purpose and to obtain agency input on the project.



Although none of the 28 agencies initially contacted were interested in being cooperating agencies, the following agencies agreed to be participating agencies: USFWS, UTA, Utah SHPO, and WFRC. In addition, all five cities located along the corridor (City of Syracuse, City of Roy, City of West Point, City of Clinton, and City of West Haven) agreed to be participating agencies.

7.2.3 Opportunities for the Participating Agencies To Help Develop the Project Purpose and Alternatives

Project representatives coordinated with representatives from the participating agencies throughout the environmental review process. The participating agencies were given draft copies of Chapter 1, Purpose of and Need for Action, and Chapter 2, Alternatives, of this EIS for input and collaboration as they were developed. The participating agencies did not provide any comments on the project purpose elements or the methodology developed to analyze the alternatives. All general comments that were received regarding Chapters 1 and 2 were responded to. Relevant comments were incorporated into the chapters.

7.3 Public Coordination

In addition to agency coordination, public input plays an important role in identifying issues and generating solutions regarding future improvements to S.R. 108. No one knows the area better than those who live along and drive along S.R. 108 every day. Throughout the environmental review process, the project team encouraged involvement from neighboring communities to help identify issues and develop solutions to improve S.R. 108. All public and agency comments received to date have been considered for this project.

The public was notified of the requirements of SAFETEA-LU Section 6002 at the public scoping meetings. This EIS meets the intent of this regulation by reaching out to the public and giving the public an opportunity to provide input into and collaborate on the processes of defining the project purpose and identifying the alternatives.

Why is public input important to the S.R. 108 project?

Public input is important because no one knows the area better than those who live along and drive along S.R. 108 every day. UDOT relies on public comments to help identify issues as well as to gauge public sentiment about the proposed improvements.

7.3.1 Public Involvement Plan

The purpose of the S.R. 108 Public Involvement Plan is to identify the tools by which the S.R. 108 EIS project team will work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that the public's concerns and suggestions are consistently understood and considered. The Public Involvement Plan promises the public that UDOT and FHWA will work with them to ensure that their concerns and suggestions are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and that UDOT and FHWA will provide feedback on how their input influenced the decision.

7.3.2 Public Scoping

Public scoping is a key component of the environmental review process. UDOT relies on public comments to help identify issues as well as to gauge public sentiment about the proposed improvements. Because some of the alternatives under consideration for the project could affect adjacent property owners, a combination of measures was taken to ensure that the public was notified about the project and invited to participate in the process.

7.3.2.1 Public Scoping Meeting

The S.R. 108 scoping period was initiated with the *Federal Register* notice on June 26, 2006. UDOT held a public scoping meeting on August 3, 2006, at Syracuse Elementary School, 1503 South 2000 West, in Syracuse. The meeting was held in an open-house format with an interactive workshop from 4:00 PM to 7:00 PM.

The following methods were used to notify the general public of the public scoping meeting and scoping activities:

- Advertisements were placed in the following publications:
 - *Davis County Clipper*, July 25 and August 1, 2006
 - *Ogden Standard-Examiner*, July 22 and July 31, 2006
 - *The Deseret Morning News*, July 21 and July 31, 2006
 - *The Salt Lake Tribune*, July 21 and July 31, 2006
- More than 3,800 individually addressed letters were sent to all property owners within 0.25 mile of S.R. 108.



- Twenty 2-foot-by-3-foot signs were placed in property owners' yards at about 1-mile intervals along S.R. 108.
- Media releases were prepared and distributed to local news outlets. Prior to the public scoping meeting, stories about the S.R. 108 project appeared in both the *Davis County Clipper* and the *Ogden Standard-Examiner*.

The primary issues raised by the public included questions regarding impacts to individual properties, the project schedule, and immediate safety improvements. Copies of the scoping materials listed above and comments received are included in the Scoping Summary Report.

7.3.2.2 Meeting Format

The following is the general format of the public scoping meeting.

Open House

- The public was encouraged but not required to sign in at the registration desk.
- Each participant was given a comment sheet and a project flyer detailing the display materials, information about how to submit comments, and additional contact information.
- Displays included study area maps, the preliminary purpose of and need for the project, examples of possible alternatives, an overview of the NEPA process, preliminary traffic and population data, an overview of UDOT's right-of-way acquisition process, a project schedule, community impact information, and details on how to become involved and remain involved in the environmental review process.
- Project staff members were positioned near stations of their area of expertise to help answer questions and provide information.
- Attendees were encouraged to view the display materials and submit questions or comments on the materials provided.

Workshop

- The workshop was conducted in a separate room from the open house. The workshop room contained five stations, each of which represented a city along S.R. 108. The public was asked to identify issues on the maps provided for each city.
- A list of questions was posted at each station to help the public identify the types of issues that would help direct the environmental review process.
- Poster paper was available to allow participants to write down individual issues in a format that was visible to all attendees.
- Comment forms were distributed to attendees as they arrived. Additional comment forms were available at tables around the room.
- Self-addressed stamped envelopes were available to anyone who wanted to submit comments at a later date.
- Attendees were also invited to submit comments by e-mail or on the project Web site. The e-mail and Web site addresses were listed on all handout materials.

A total of 208 people attended the public scoping meeting on August 3, 2006. Copies of all public meeting materials and comments received during the public scoping period are included in the Scoping Summary Report.

7.3.3 Community Impact Assessment Surveys

In addition to the information collected for the EIS, various community representatives were also asked to complete one of three surveys for the S.R. 108 Community Impact Assessment:

- **Community Impact Survey.** The Community Impact Survey was sent to over 700 property owners along S.R. 108 and was also distributed at the public scoping meeting. The survey was intended to help the project team better understand the types of communities along S.R. 108 to gauge how the proposed improvements could affect the communities.

What surveys were part of the Community Impact Assessment?

The Community Impact Assessment included a Community Impact Survey, a Business Impact Survey, and a School Survey. In all, over 1,500 surveys were distributed to community members along S.R. 108.



- **Business Impact Survey.** The Business Impact Survey was hand-delivered to all businesses along S.R. 108. The survey was intended to help the project team better understand the types of businesses along S.R. 108 to determine how the proposed improvements could affect the local business community.
- **School Survey.** The School Survey was sent home with all 850 students at Syracuse Elementary School. The survey was developed in coordination with the Davis School District to be a kid-friendly survey with data that could be easily manipulated into a school classroom project. It was intended to help the project team identify student crossing patterns. School representatives are looking at ways to use the survey data in conjunction with GIS technology to provide students with a real-life project example.

7.3.4 City Council Presentations

In September 2006, team members gave presentations to city councils and county commissioners in communities along S.R. 108. The presentations to the city councils and county commissions were advertised on the project Web site, and press releases were distributed to local newspapers. Below is a list of meeting dates and locations.

City Councils

- September 5, 2006 – City of Roy
- September 5, 2006 – City of West Point
- September 5, 2006 – City of West Haven
- September 12, 2006 – City of Syracuse
- September 12, 2006 – City of Clinton

County Commissions

- October 17, 2006 – Weber County
- November 20, 2006 – Davis County

7.3.5 Focus Groups

Representatives from communities along S.R. 108 were solicited and invited to participate in a focus group. About 28 representatives from the adjacent communities as well as city representatives, members of the business community, and individuals from the local school districts participated in the focus group meetings. The first meeting was held on September 27, 2006. About 20 group members and nine project representatives participated in the meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to identify issues on maps and collaborate on the methodology for analyzing the preliminary alternatives and alignments.

A second meeting was held on January 24, 2007. One purpose of this meeting was to show the focus group how their input had been incorporated or to explain why it had not. An additional purpose of the meeting was to review the methodology used to analyze the alternatives. Group members were also given the opportunity to review the alignments that had been considered and were also asked for their input regarding public display materials for the alternative review workshop. Representatives from the UDOT Right-of-Way Division presented information regarding the property acquisition process. New displays were generated based on the feedback from the focus group.

A third meeting was held November 27, 2007. The purposes of this meeting were to update the focus group on the status of the Draft EIS and to review alignment alternatives considered as well as to discuss UDOT's preferred alignment. Other meeting objectives included a review of noise studies, a project update on the Hinckley Drive Extension, and UDOT right-of-way processes. Group members were given the opportunity to give feedback on all information and were asked for their input on additional information that would be beneficial to the public.

7.3.6 Alternative Review Workshop

On February 7, 2007, the project team held a workshop to allow the public an opportunity to review the alignments considered and the impacts associated with each alignment. About 750 invitations were sent to property owners along S.R. 108. The project team provided large-scale maps of the alignments being carried forward for detailed

What were the purposes of the focus group meetings?

The purposes of the initial focus group meeting were to identify issues and collaborate on a methodology for analyzing the preliminary alternatives and alignments. The purposes of the second meeting were to show the group how their input had been used and to review the methodology used to analyze the alternatives. The purposes of the third meeting were to update the focus group on the status of the Draft EIS and to review alignment alternatives considered as well as to discuss UDOT's preferred alignment.

What concerns were raised at the Alternative Review Workshop?

The primary concerns from the public involved the property acquisition process and the schedule for acquisition.



study. Representatives from the UDOT Right-of-Way Division answered questions regarding the property acquisition process. Although close to 100 people attended the workshop, only 11 provided comments regarding the displays and alignments. The primary concerns from the public involved the property acquisition process and the schedule for acquisition.

7.3.7 Other Public Outreach

The project team also coordinated directly with stakeholders along S.R. 108 using various methods. The list below describes some of the other outreach methods used for this project:

- Informational newsletters sent to property owners
 - January 31, 2007 (750 newsletters sent directly to property owners along S.R. 108)
 - April 15, 2007 (newsletters hand-delivered along S.R. 108)
- One-on-one contact with stakeholders
 - More than 100 one-on-one contacts were made between project representatives and area stakeholders including personal visits, discussions at neighborhood council meetings, phone conversations, and e-mail exchanges.
- Project team members were invited to private residences to discuss the project, address right-of-way concerns, and answer questions in an informal setting
 - August 21, 2007 (West Point residence, 16 attended)
 - September 6, 2007 (West Point residence, 13 attended)
- Numerous meetings with city staff members
- Updates and Web links on the Syracuse, West Point, Clinton City, Roy, and West Haven Web sites
- Updates in city newsletters
- Press releases and media outreach through UDOT
 - Press Release: UDOT Seeks Public Input on S.R. 108 Environmental Study, West Haven in Weber County to Syracuse in Davis County (July 31, 2006)
 - *Ogden Standard-Examiner*, August 1, 2006

- *Davis County Clipper*, August 2, 2006
- *Ogden Standard-Examiner*, August 4, 2006
- *Ogden Standard-Examiner*, August 10, 2006 (Editorial)
- *Ogden Standard-Examiner*, September 7, 2006
- *Ogden Standard-Examiner*, October 24, 2006
- Press Release: UDOT Seeks Public Input on S.R. 108 Environmental Study, West Haven in Weber County to Syracuse in Davis County (February 2, 2007)
- *Davis County Clipper*, February 7, 2007
- *Ogden Standard-Examiner*, February 8, 2007 (Editorial)
- Press Release: UDOT Identifies Preferred Alternative for S.R. 108 Corridor, 1900 West in West Haven to Antelope Drive in Syracuse (November 30, 2007)
- *Ogden Standard-Examiner*, December 6, 2007
- *Ogden Standard-Examiner*, December 24, 2007
- Project updates
- A public open house was held jointly with the Hinckley Drive Extension Environmental Re-evaluation project on May 29, 2008. Due to design changes on the Hinckley Drive project, it was determined that improvements would be necessary between Hinckley Drive/3600 South and 1900 West. The purpose of this meeting was to gather public input about these changes to the S.R. 108 study, share results of the Hinckley Drive environmental re-evaluation with the public, and provide information about the anticipated construction schedule for the Hinckley Drive Extension. UDOT and project staff were available to talk about project schedules, proposed roadway alignments, right-of-way impacts, and the funding status for both projects. About 60 people attended the meeting, and no major comments were provided regarding the change to the S.R. 108 project.
- Project update presentations
 - Syracuse Lions Club, May 6, 2008
 - West Haven City Council, May 7, 2008



7.3.8 Draft EIS Public Hearing

A Notice of Availability on the Draft EIS was published in the *Federal Register* on November 15, 2007, to formally announce the availability of the Draft EIS. The notice stated that comments on the Draft EIS were due by January 7, 2008.

A public hearing for the S.R. 108 Draft EIS was held at Syracuse Elementary School on December 5, 2007. The meeting presented the findings of the Draft EIS and solicited public input on the proposed improvements along the corridor. The hearing used an open-house format. A court reporter was available to take verbal comments. The meeting was held from 5:00 PM to 7:00 PM, and about 70 people attended the meeting.

The following methods were used to notify the public of the open house and hearing:

- Display ads were placed in the *Davis County Clipper* (November 20 and 27, 2007) as well as the *Salt Lake Tribune* and *Deseret Morning News* (November 21 and 28, 2007) and the *Ogden Standard-Examiner* (November 21 and 28, 2007).
- A newsletter with meeting notification was mailed by ZIP code drop to the S.R. 108 corridor area as well as to stakeholder addresses collected over the course of the project. The mailing included 823 addresses.
- Meeting information was posted on the project Web site. Several people also used the Web site to view copies of the Draft EIS. The Web site address was included on all printed materials including the press releases.

The following is the general format of the public hearing:

- The public was encouraged but not required to sign in at the registration desk.
- Extra copies of the November 2007 newsletter were provided at the registration desk and at various locations near the displays. This newsletter explained the NEPA process and included a map of the area, the traffic alternatives considered, the expected impacts of the alternatives, right-of-way considerations, and other relevant information.

- Displays were placed around the room that explained the purpose and scope of the project, details about the project, how the project could affect the community, and opportunities for input. A scroll plot of the corridor was also placed on long tables in the room to provide information and give context to comments.
- Project team members responded to comments and questions about the project.
- Comment forms were provided. Additionally, a court reporter was available to take verbal comments.
- In addition to the public hearing, the following presentations were given to city councils and county commissions regarding the results of the Draft EIS:

City Councils

- December 4, 2007 – City of West Point
- December 11, 2007 – City of Clinton
- December 11, 2007 – City of Syracuse
- December 18, 2007 – City of Roy
- December 19, 2007 – City of West Haven

County Commissions

- November 30, 2007 – Davis County
- December 11, 2007 – Weber County



7.3.9 Web Site

The S.R. 108 EIS Web site, www.udot.utah.gov/sr108study, is referenced on the UDOT Region 1 home page and allows the public to view current S.R. 108 project information. The Web site provides all project-related materials and is updated periodically as new information becomes available. Comments can be submitted to the project public involvement coordinator through the site at any time. The site includes the following elements:

- Upcoming project events and recent news
- Project background information
 - Long-range plans for adjacent communities
 - Long-range transportation plan for WFRC
 - Project purpose and need
 - Preliminary traffic and level of service data
- Documents in Portable Document Format (PDF) of all presentation materials
- Scoping summary report
- Project newsletters
- Maps of the preliminary alignments and cross-sections
- Description of the National Environmental Policy Act
- Project schedule
- Comment forms and contact information
- Links to Web sites for adjacent cities
- Draft EIS

What information is available on the project Web site?

The S.R. 108 Web site provides all project-related materials and is updated periodically as new information becomes available. Comments can also be submitted through the Web site at any time.

7.4 Conclusion

The project team has received input from the agency representatives, city and county officials, residents, and businesses along S.R. 108 as well as users of S.R. 108. Most stakeholders have agreed that improvements are needed along S.R. 108. However, the public has identified property acquisitions and the project schedule as their primary concerns. Public input has helped the project team balance and prioritize the alternatives to meet the needs of the public as a whole. The public has also provided the necessary support for the action alternatives.

All comments will be considered before UDOT and FHWA issue a decision on the project.